The Educational Record

Volume Eleven Number Four

OCTOBER, 1930

PUBLISHED BY
The American Council on Education
Washington, D. C.

The Educational Record

Published Quarterly by

The American Council on Education

Volume 11 October, 1930 No. 4

Editor:
C. R. MANN

CONTENTS

To the Scholars of America
By Benito Mussolini

Virgil and the Modern World
By Nobile Giacomo de Martino

Some Educational Questions
By Robert M. Hutchins

International Intellectual Co-operation

The American Way
By C. R. Mann

California Junior College Mental-Educational Survey
By W. C. Eells

Index

Annual Subscription, $2.00

COPYRIGHT, 1930
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

NATIONAL CAPITAL PRESS, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

To the Scholars of America[1]

"I appreciate, Mr. President, the occasion offered to turn my thoughts to your University, illustrious for fame of rigorous disciplines in studies and for the glorious name of George Washington.

"The United States are celebrating, with particular understanding of the Virgilian soul, the second millennium of the greatest poet of Romanity, whose immortal verses have survived through the centuries and who still speaks to the young of daring and steadfastness in adversity, of love of mother earth and of devotion to the fruitful works of Peace.

"I am particularly pleased to extend on this day to you, Mr. President, my greetings to the Atheneum over which you preside and through you to all the scholars of the great American Nation."

MUSSOLINI.

[1] Message from Premier Mussolini delivered through the Italian Ambassador at the Convocation of The George Washington University, held in recognition of the bimillennial celebration of the birth of Virgil, October 15, 1930.

Virgil and the Modern World[2]

ALLOW me to tell you frankly that, when your President asked me whether I was disposed to be the official speaker at this Virgilian celebration, I wondered if it would be right for me to accept to address this distinguished and learned audience on this subject. In fact, I am not a Virgilian scholar. I wish I were—that I had the time to be.

All I shall attempt to do is to call again to your attention the Roman and Italian ideal Virgil created, and the tremendous significance and influence that ideal has had and is still having in molding the culture all civilized nations enjoy today, and of which we Italians are so justly proud.

This date, October 15, is the two thousandth anniversary of our poet's birth. He was the son of a farmer in the Andes district, which lies not very far from the present city of Mantua. Like the great Spanish hero of the Middle Ages, the Cid, Virgil may well be said to have been "born in a fortunate hour." He came at a time when the old Rome was undergoing a deep social and political transformation and he saw, not only the lessons the past taught, but with a prophet's vision he saw far ahead into the densely veiled future and not only predicted what was to come, but, by the force and clearness of his vision, materially helped in compelling it to come to pass. So today all over the world Virgil's birth is celebrated. It is appropriate, too, that here, under the auspices of this great university in your National Capital, you should honor the man whose single influence has done more than any other to give modern thought, however indirectly, its logic and its permanence. As the official representative of my country in yours, I esteem highly the honor you have done me in asking me to address you this evening; in giving me this opportunity to express to you in some measure the

[2] Address delivered by His Excellency Nobile Giacomo de Martino, Italian Ambassador to the United States, at the Convocation of The George Washington University, held in recognition of the bimillennial celebration of the birth of Virgil, October 15, 1930.

reasons why we Italians venerate our great poet, why we feel that any sort of celebration, any sort of commemoration, is inadequate and weak in comparison with his qualities.

The finest celebration of all lies not in mere poetry, praising Virgil; not in any commemorative medals, or special editions of his works. It is this very thing we are doing here tonight: this discussing the practical idealism of the poet, and the benefits humanity owes directly to him. In this there are neither Italians nor Americans. There is no special sense of racial pride which excludes all other peoples. Virgil's work, though done primarily for Rome, was really done for all mankind. His work is not yet finished. I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, as surely as you are listening to my voice, the influence of Virgil, the noble and beneficent idealism which begins faintly in the Eclogues or pastoral poems, glows in the Georgics and reaches the full splendor of its fire and power in the Aeneid, cannot attain its climax until the thing all honest men are hoping for becomes solidly established. I mean World Peace; a world peace established on mutual understanding and human love.

Itala virtus ac Romana potentia! Virtue and Strength, once Roman only, now recognized and adopted in principle by the whole world that is struggling earnestly and honestly to rid itself of the burdens of war.

Truly is Virgil still a living inspiration, a potent guide toward what, only a few years since, all men regarded as chimerical, Utopian.

The United States is a living example of that combination of force and virtue first proclaimed by Virgil. I have not the slightest doubt—on the authority of American scholars—that if your "Conscript Fathers" who framed the Constitution and decided the destinies of your country, knowing full well the dangers they incurred, had not been brought up on Virgil and the other classics, your government—more, your whole conception of government and of the rights of your people—would have taken different form.

In this academic atmosphere I feel I can safely express my regret that in recent years the classics have fallen somewhat

into disuse as both training for the student and stimulus for the public mind. Mathematics and other sciences are admirable. Yet all science is specialization. It connotes little beyond its own limited field; it never carries with it what we may call a broad correlative culture. The classics always do, and he who once makes the classical authors his own knows no loneliness though he live forever!

But what are "classics," and why do we include Virgil as having a striking place in the van of them all? I remember having seen the word "classic" defined as "Any book or work of art that may be or is regarded as a standard or model—especially, any artistic reproduction of Greek or Roman genius." Virgil satisfies that definition completely. His Eclogues struck an entirely new note in letters. He had invented the poetry of humanism. The Georgics, when at last they left his hand, constituted the most perfect and polished work of letters ever produced by the Roman world of genius. Last of all, the Aeneid, throbbing with its long pondered tale of human sacrifice and human passion, notwithstanding its obvious imperfections, set a standard and created a model which still endures. Indeed, what work of letters since Virgil's time can stand comparison with it? Dante frankly acknowledged himself the disciple of the greater Master. Milton, Dryden, Tennyson, Keats, Matthew Arnold, all admitted their philosophic debt, all sang the earlier poet's praises and yearned for his mastery of language. In our own times a young American has produced a truly American poem that never could have been written had not Virgil first sung of "Arms and the man." "John Brown's body," truly epic in quality, would never have been conceived by any man not steeped in the wholesome tradition of Virgil.

Beside affording a model and a standard because of their inherent excellence, the works of Virgil bear upon the life of today, first because of the humanity of Virgil's viewpoint, and second because of the universality of his themes and treatment. So thoroughly has this been understood that Virgil is practically the only Latin great poet who has never been forgotten for a moment; no, not even during the Dark

Ages. During practically all the years of the two millennia that have elapsed since his birth, his work has been a textbook for the schoolboy, a golden mine of incalculable richness for the delight of mature minds, a mighty stimulus to the creative artist. Because the poet expressed himself in terms beyond the usual limitations of time and space; because his conception of the problems of life illuminated the experience of men of every age and clime; because he clothed his ideas with "the utmost beauty, melody and significance of which human words seem to be capable." Virgil is as real to us, as vital in the life of today as he was to his own Rome. He is a classic because of all I have said; because his influence is just as strong, as enriching and uplifting now as it was at first, giving us a vivid interpretation of all that perplexes us today.

Perhaps the most striking thing about any of the classics is their familiarity combined with their perennial freshness. Virgil certainly is not new to any of us. From a thousand sources we know him indirectly in a thousand ways. Yet, when for the first time we read him, we find not only nothing stale, nothing outworn, but the freshness and vivacity of something wholly new, mingled with the joy of our recognition for something as familiar as an old friend. Here is all the beauty of the worlds of both matter and spirit; the glory and charm of Nature, the marvel of the human soul. In the Eclogues the poet combines the verdant charm of Italy in the spring, the radiant beauty of our mountains and rivers, our lakes and bowers, our plains and orchards, with the appeal of close human relationships. The Bucolics, or Georgics, in lines of unexcelled perfection and magic, sing the simple, pious, wholesome daily life of our peasants and the delight their work in the fields gave them. The outdoor life! Country life in Italy! Did you know, my friends, that the only "gainful occupation" in the Rome of Virgil's time and earlier that was recognized as worthy was agriculture? The beauty and veracity with which Virgil has shown us the peasant's love for his home and family, his passionate devotion to the soil, the contrast between this rustic serenity and

the hectic life of the city, is as true today as when it was written. No one has been more truly and fully representative of the loftiest aspirations and the purest sentiment of both his country and his time.

It is needless for me here to point out to such an audience as this the mere technical excellence of Virgil's Aeneid. The poem in structure has been compared to a vast basilica entered through a triple narthex and graced with parallel aisles. You know its beauties, its astounding grasp of the very springs of human conduct. Who can forget the "pious Aeneas" who bowed to the will of the gods and considered not self but duty? Dido the immortal, one of the few towering female figures in the world of letters for all time—how Virgil lavished his finest study upon her delineation! And how readily we understand, when we view the poem as a whole, that Virgil did not himself call it the Aeneid at all. His title was the far broader, more suggestive one of *Gesta Populi Romani: The Achievements of the Roman people.*

Probably the Romans of Virgil's time did not recognize his genius so fully as we do two thousand years later. It is true that each of his three great works created an immediate furore. Virgil, like the English poet, awoke to find himself famous overnight when the Eclogues appeared. Soon a high school in Rome adopted them as a textbook, and the satirist Juvenal says in his Seventh Satire that the careless boys handled copies of "Horace altogether discolored," while the "well-thumbed Maro" was black with the grime of many unwashed and restless young hands.

We have an advantage over the schoolboys and the rhetoricians of Virgil's time. To them the Eclogues and the Bucolics, even the Aeneid when it appeared after the poet's death, were isolated works of art. After two thousand years we, on the contrary, are aided by the perspectives of time and distance. We see Virgil's work entire, set in its proper foreground and background, not detached or single. So it becomes for us the reducing glass in which is presented the whole broad range and focus of Roman life, of all its myriad phases and movement. We see in it beauties and

subtleties the Romans doubtless never even guessed: just as we appreciate that other immortal, Shakespeare, much more fully than did his audiences in the Elizabethan Age, when he was merely the best of many dramatic poets.

In closing, permit me to make one suggestion, to call your attention to the striking likeness between this age of ours and the one in which Virgil lived. The more we ponder this similarity, the more fully will we appreciate the poet's message and the better and more clearly shall we see him, not merely as either artist or historian, but as the immortal interpreter of "the abiding significance of the Roman thought, but Roman culture, in their relation to our own times."

NOBILE GIACOMO DE MARTINO,
Italian Embassy, Washington, D. C.

Some Educational Questions[1]

I MAKE no apology for asking the members of the graduating class to consider briefly one or two educational questions. Aside from the fact that many of you are going to be teachers, you are all now very highly educated. And, what is more important for my purposes, you are probably thinking today more intently about education than you ever have before or ever will again. While you are in this propitious frame of mind, therefore, I cannot refrain from taking advantage of you to discuss some things about education that may perplex you, and that have certainly perplexed your instructors.

In a university the broad, general problem of education is the adjustment of the institution to the individual. We find this problem in more or less acute form with faculty members, graduate and professional students, and undergraduates. It seems to arise with all of these groups because of the number of individuals with whom we have to deal. Under a rule legally enforced until a few years ago, and enforced through tradition in too many sections of this university today, every member of the faculty had to teach two majors a quarter. It made no difference whether he was a good teacher, or whether there were two majors he could teach, or whether there were any students who wanted to be taught either of the two majors. He taught two majors a quarter. The result was, and in some cases still is, that men who should have taught more taught too little; men who should have taught less taught too much; and course after course sprang up with no better reason for existence than that everybody had to teach two majors and there had to be two majors for him to teach. The two-major rule may have been a convenient method of being sure that you got something from a faculty that was growing so rapidly that you could not deal with individuals; it can hardly be recommended on any other ground.

[1]Convocation address at the University of Chicago, June 10, 1930.

THE UNIVERSITY AN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

In some divisions of the University there has been a feeling more potent than a rule that distinction in research in subject matter should be the sole prerequisite to recognition in any university. This seems to me to overlook the fact that a university is an educational institution. I do not say it ought to be; I say it is. Since it is, it should, I suppose, attempt to do the best job in education that it can. Unless people who are interested in education can believe that their interest will lead to advancement, they will not retain it long, and the education administered will be mediocre at best. Of course it is a fair question whether a university ought to be an educational institution. Perhaps it ought to be a research institution. But the change in title is not important for a university like this. If the purpose of a university is inquiry, it will hardly be able to avoid inquiry into education, one of the most significant activities of mankind. And inquiry into education will show on the college and university level that most of its major problems—whom to teach, how to teach, and what to teach—are still unsolved. Since it is doubtful if they can be solved by arm-chair meditation, it follows that a complete collegiate organization is necessary in the university for the study of these problems as they present themselves in real life.

This is particularly true here, for we are surrounded by other universities not so free to experiment as we are, which look to Chicago to show the way. We shall not long be able to do so unless we are willing to differentiate the individuals on our staff, to provide different kinds of opportunity for different men, to adjust the content and amount of each scholar's work to his individual capacity, and to reward him for contributing to our knowledge of education as we should reward him if he contributed to our knowledge of any other subject.

In dealing with students the same lack of adjustment of the university to the individual appears, and apparently for the same reason: there are so many of them that to deal with them at all we have to deal with them as though they were

identical. Professional work may well be started, presumably, at the end of a good general education. But we have assumed first that all of college work was general education, and second that the longer a man stayed in college the better his education was. And consequently in the effort to get better students in professional schools we have constantly raised the number of years in college required for entrance to them. But it must be clear that the great advantage of the graduate professional school is not in the maturity of students or in the preparation of students, but in the segregation of students. Segregation into a serious professional group has turned many a collegiate loafer into a first-rate professional man. But it has in many professions extended the period of training to quite disproportionate lengths. The graduates of some of the so-called best law schools cannot start practice before they are twenty-five, and the graduates of some medical schools of the same grade cannot begin to earn a living until they are past twenty-seven. It has never been established that there was anything mystical about these particular ages or this particular background. Whether four years of strenuous attention to football and fraternities is the ideal preparation for the study of law, for instance, has never been seriously investigated. In the effort to find an arbitrary automatic yardstick that would have the effect of reducing numbers and producing a homogeneous group, we have required and have sometimes succeeded in getting embalmed in law mere temporal qualifications that have small relation to individual competence.

COLLEGE YEARS AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

And since we have had no standard in some professional schools but the number of college years, we have felt that the larger that number the higher our standard. I have always been interested in the discussions of law-school deans to observe the embarrassed blushes of one of them when he discovered that another school of which he had not hitherto had much opinion actually had higher standards, by which he meant longer collegiate requirements, than his own. About the only way in which a law school could attain prestige and

aspire to leadership was to require more, not better, but more college work of all, not some, but all its prospective students. And so between our desire for a simple test of qualifications for entrance and our desire for prestige we have committed ourselves in some institutions to a system of pre-professional requirements which diminishes the student's opportunities without necessarily producing counterbalancing benefits to him, to the community, or to us.

The student who plans to be a college teacher or a research worker suffers from the same failure of the university to adjust itself to the individual that is represented by arbitrary entrance requirements, and from something more. The professional student generally plans to enter the profession, and the curriculum is designed with that in mind. Although most graduate students plan to enter a profession, their curriculum is not designed with that in mind. Their course of study is of the same type whether they intend to be college teachers or research workers or both. Since there are great unsolved problems in college teaching, it would seem that those who know they are going into it might learn something about them before they go. Since the man who is going to be primarily a research worker needs primarily training in research work, it would seem that the more of such work and the fewer formal courses he had the better prepared he would be.

Here again the remorseless uniformity of our method of treatment seems to result from the colossal number of graduate students. The activities of the standardizing agencies have made it necessary for the colleges to require graduate work of their teachers. The graduate schools have therefore been swamped with hordes of people whose principal object was the acquisition of some sort of insignia that would enable them to get a better teaching position than they would otherwise secure. I do not say that this is not a laudable object. I merely say that frank recognition of the fact that this is their object may lead us to inquire whether graduate schools exist to help them to accomplish it, and, if so, whether we can find some way of helping them to accomplish it without ruining the researches of our professors and damaging the education of research workers. If we conclude, as I think

we should at the University of Chicago, that we have some obligation to influence higher education in the Middle West through the intelligent preparation of excellent teachers, then we must differentiate among the individuals who come to us for graduate work, giving to each the opportunity he desires and for which he is qualified, and attempting to prevent the curriculum of one group from definitively molding the curriculum of the other.

NEW ADJUSTMENTS

Of course the adjustment of the university to the individual in the graduate and professional school depends on this adjustment at an earlier period. If the chief advantage of graduate professional study of any kind is segregation into a serious professional group, the question arises whether the same attitude can ever be secured in a collegiate group. Although I doubt if it can ever be completely secured, it would appear that a considerable number of things could be done that would bring us closer to it. The prosperity of the country, the supposed social and commercial advantages of college life, and the requirements of the professions and the professional schools have brought us tremendous quantities of college students. They all enter in the same way and, after accumulating the same number of credits with the same minimum scholastic average, are sent forth as educated people. It is difficult to believe that they all have the same ability or the same preparation or the same degree of interest in educating themselves. And by insisting for reasons of convenience that they all be reduced to the same mathematical formula we have doubtless done something to defeat what interest and ability they had. In a law school of which I was once the dean we had to buy an adding machine to determine whether our students graduated. They had to have a weighted average of sixty-five for seventy-two points. The calculations involved in the process of deciding whether they were educated so far surpassed the abilities of the dean and even of the registrar that we had to resort to mechanical methods of ascertaining their intellectual equipment. The whole system was justified by the conviction that we could

not do anything else with so many students, and the same excuse serves to justify the bookkeeping methods by which today most colleges determine the degree of education their students have achieved. Our whole system is set up for the average student, with the result that in any well-organized college there probably is not a single regulation governing the curriculum that a really excellent student should not break. Whatever one's view of a university, one may well doubt the value of such restriction. If a university is an educational institution, should it not give its finest opportunities to its best students? And if a university is a research institution inquiring into education, can it hope to develop inquirers or develop inquiries under a system that inhibits both initiative and experiment? A university which aims to forward inquiry is naturally concerned about the production of men and women competent in and devoted to such inquiry. No one can be long in university work without becoming aware of the present scarcity of such individuals. Although the low level of faculty salaries is undoubtedly in large part responsible, there is another factor at work, and that is the method and content of collegiate instruction. Many people go to college with a real and even remarkable excitement about scholarship. Still more could be excited if they could believe that there was anything important or vital in what the scholar does. In far too many cases this present or potential excitement dies in the face of the peculiarities of the American collegiate system. The first duty of a college in a university is to organize itself so that a student who wishes to become a scholar will not have insuperable obstacles put in his path.

NUMBERS AND STANDARDS

Such organization in both the university and college is not as impossible as it may appear. It does not necessarily follow that as numbers rise standards must fall. In many places as numbers have risen standards have fallen. But this is rather because we have not had time to think than because of any inevitable connection between numbers and standards. If we had time to think about education instead of being

forced to provide something that would look like it for the multitudes who suddenly demanded it, we should have directed our attention in the first instance to the achievements of individuals. In order to test those achievements we should have worked out criteria applicable at the various levels. Instead of asking how many years in high school a student had had, we should determine what kind of training we should require for entrance to a college. We should next have to determine what accomplishments a man leaving the junior college should possess to show that he has finished his general higher education. As a person sought entrance to the university for either senior college or professional and graduate work, he should be required to submit evidence of his power to deal with it, and should be graduated only after he had met tests indicating that he had the knowledge and ability that reflected the criteria previously established for graduation.

You will say that this is exactly what is done at the present time. At every stage students are required to submit evidence of their previous training, showing either that they are ready to go on with their education or that it is complete. The trouble is that all this is stated in terms of what a student has been through instead of in terms of what he has learned and what he can do. We have been unwilling to go behind the record. We take that record with its courses and grades, forgetting that these give slight indication of the permanent information or inspiration derived from the schooling they represent. We have talked in the language of time, forgetting that we must therefore talk of the average student and that by insisting on temporal requirements we do our best to compel the best students to be average too.

The time that is wasted by good men and women through this insistence on time spent as the principal indication of intellectual attainment is enormous. Particularly does this waste occur in the process of passing from one institution to another, where the high school duplicates the grades, the college duplicates the high school, and the university duplicates the college. If it is impossible to articulate the grades, the high school, the college, and the graduate and professional

school by general categorical rules, it ought to be possible to articulate them by articulating the work of the individual. In the college and university if we develop first the criteria of entrance to and completion of general higher education, if we then develop the criteria of entrance to and completion of non-professional and professional specialized education, and if we at each stage employ general examinations with such other devices as may be necessary to be taken by the student when in his opinion he is ready for them, we eliminate for any given individual the loss of time and the loss of initiative which at present curse our educational system. If then an individual remains at any level longer than the average student, it will be because he needs to remain there; if he goes on earlier, it will be because he is qualified to go on.

EDUCATION A HARD JOB

Such a system, eliminating or minimizing course examinations, course credits, course grades, and time requirements, is open to two serious objections. In the first place, the educational criteria and the testing devices to which I have glibly referred are difficult to work out. But this amounts simply to saying that education is a hard job and a good deal harder than we may have thought. Since we must admit that our present methods are defective, we shall have to admit that we should exert what intelligence we have to improve them. The successful installation of such a scheme, or of a better one designed to accomplish the same objectives, will require long and painstaking thought. But thought is what education today requires; and if we are in education, it is our business to put it forth.

In the second place some such system as I have suggested, since it places the responsibility for his education on the student, must carry with it some arrangement whereby the student may enjoy intimate relations with instructors in fields in which he needs and demands them. The adjustment of the university to the individual cannot proceed on any other basis. This raises at once an economic problem. No matter how many controlled experiments may seem to suggest the contrary, we shall always have a vague feeling

that individual instruction of the poorest students by the best teachers will be better for the student than mass instruction by the same or poorer teachers. But we simply can't afford to deal with our poorest students that way. There aren't enough good teachers to go around; why should we wear them out in the hope of rescuing a few men and women who at best will never do more than take a harmless place in the community? If we can afford individualized instruction at all, we can afford it first for those who can profit by it most and who will most amply repay the effort and expense devoted to them. The question before any university, therefore, is not whether individualized education is desirable, but whether the university, in view of the other demands upon it, can afford to give individualized education at all. Still, if we take the large lecture course as a base and select from it only those who are particularly interested and qualified for more individual instruction, without assuming the necessity of small classes and quiz sections in all courses for all students, we can accomplish everything I have in mind without additions to our faculties. And when we are ready to concede that even some Freshmen in some fields are able to learn something by themselves and are likely to develop powers of independent thought and effort only as we permit them to do independent work, we shall again revise our notions of the number of professors that a given number of students require for the best development of their individual talents.

By much thought and much patience, therefore, in spite of the economic problem and the present vagueness of the criteria we must ascertain, we may in some such ways as these adjust the university to the individual and the individual to the university. In some such ways as these we may make the college a place for the exploration of the realms of knowledge and the university a place for the beginning of a life of learning and inquiry. Then perhaps even the learned professions may become learned. And we may produce a generation more educated than our own and individuals better educated than ourselves.

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS,
University of Chicago.

Re-organization of International Intellectual Co-operation[1]

I. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY

THE report of the Committee of Enquiry made the twelfth session an unusually important one. This report is given in full in the form of an appendix. There would be no point, therefore, in reproducing it here, and we need only indicate which parts the Committee maintained, which it has altered, or even deleted, and, lastly, the construction it has placed upon the report. We have now reached the conclusion of a task found necessary in view of present circumstances and the teaching of experience, the starting-point of which was indicated in the 1928 and 1929 reports. After nine years' work in a field so wide that it may be said to be almost boundless, some general revision was felt to be needed. The revision was to cover the Committee's work, methods and organization. In the first place, a definite programme was required and, with this end in view, a choice had to be made between the numerous—perhaps unduly numerous—questions with which we had hitherto concerned ourselves. Next, the methods by which this programme should be carried out had to be decided upon, while lastly the organization had to be adapted to the work and simplified accordingly. These were the tasks of the Committee of Enquiry which the plenary Committee decided to set up, during its eleventh plenary session, on July 25, 1929, by a resolution subsequently approved by the Tenth Assembly on September 21st.

This Committee of eight members, five of whom belong to the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, while the remaining three were appointed from outside, worked uninterruptedly from April 14th to May 2nd. The Chairman of the Committee had established its agenda by referring to it

[1]From the Report of the Twelfth Plenary Session of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, held in Geneva, July 23-30, 1930.

the six questions dealt with in the six chapters of its report. For greater clarity, the headings are reproduced below:

I. General Discussion.
II. Definition of International Intellectual Co-operation within the Framework of the League of Nations.
III. What should be the Programme and Methods of Work of the Organization of Intellectual Co-operation of the League of Nations?
IV. In what Order could this Programme be best and most usefully carried out?
V. Having regard to the proposed Definition and Programme, how should the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation be Constituted so as to fulfil the Task entrusted to it by the Council of the League of Nations?
VI. The International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation as a Technical Organ of the Committee: its Rôle, its Organization, its Methods of Work, its Relations with the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, with the Governing Body and with the Secretariat at Geneva.

The Committee worked on deductive lines. It first endeavoured to define intellectual co-operation, its object, purpose and scope. From this very general definition, it plotted a field of action, framed a programme and, lastly, drew up a plan of work to be spread out over a period of—on an approximate estimate—four years. In so doing, it kept in view the principle that the work must henceforth be intensive rather than comprehensive, and that, consequently, the various problems must be taken up, not all at once, but each in turn, in order of importance and urgency. While at the beginning it was necessary to explore every branch of intellectual activity and to devote attention to very general problems, with a view to concentrating on certain aspects of those problems, actual experience has by now indicated a limited number of questions, in connection with which really useful work may be done. This in no way implies any curtailing of the programme or falling-off in the work; it means, on the contrary, that results will be more readily obtained—and by its results intellectual co-operation will be judged.

In order, however, to achieve this object, it is essential to determine the best methods and, having determined them, to see that they are employed. The term "co-operation" implies collaboration with a view to joint achievement, and hence the method pre-eminently suitable must be to interest in our work as many intellectuals as possible, interpreting this term in the comprehensive sense of organisations, scientific institutions and individuals. It is essential then, to avoid overlapping, still more any form of competition, to aim, in every case, at working in conjunction, or in collaboration with those specially qualified, and to induce as many organisations, scientific institutions and individuals as possible to take a direct interest in the work of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation. Intellectual co-operation will thus make steady progress towards the achievement of its purpose, which is to win over intellectuals to the League, and to secure their support in creating an atmosphere favourable to mutual understanding between the nations and to the pacific solution of international problems.

The practical conclusion to be drawn from this principle, and from the method it implies, is that our organisation requires to be better adapted to the work that we are asking of it. Perhaps, at the beginning, we made the mistake of conceiving a framework at once too vast, too rigid and too complicated, and of seeking then to fill in this framework by what were sometimes artificial means. This meant an over-elaboration of one machinery, and the result was a slowing-down of the work and complications often productive of more paper than results. Not, indeed, that results have been lacking; such an assertion would be essentially unjust—an unnecessary disparagement of ourselves—but better results can be obtained, first, by simplification and secondly, by a better co-ordination of the different parts that go to make up the whole structure of intellectual co-operation. To sum up the proposals: composition of the Committee itself on more rational and more intellectual lines, so that the chief branches of learning may be represented on it in proportion to their importance; abolition of the Sub-Com-

mittees, which were necessary at the beginning, but are now tending, after doing most valuable work, to become more in the nature of committees of experts; creation of an Executive and Directors' Committee to follow and supervise more closely the ever-increasing progress of intellectual co-operation, and to provide for the execution of decisions taken by the Committee at its sessions, which, for the time being, can be held only once a year; establishment of more continuous relations with the National Committees, in order to interest them more closely in our work and, lastly, re-organization of our instrument, the Paris Institute, not in order to reduce its importance, but to bring it into line with the general scheme of re-organization—these are the principles proposed by the Committee of Enquiry and accepted by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.

II. AMENDMENTS BY THE COMMITTEE TO THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY

We have just stated the underlying principles and reproduced the main features of the reform which we, in our turn, are proposing to the Council and the Assembly. This reform —we would stress the point—covers the question of intellectual co-operation viewed as a whole, not merely the Institute. But while approving, without change, many of the suggestions contained in the report of the Committee of Enquiry, the Committee found it necessary to modify, reject or supplement certain others. These modifications are designed to make it clear beyond a doubt that the Paris Institute possesses the relative autonomy and powers of initiative provided for under its Statute and under the agreements concluded, on its creation, between the League of Nations and the French Government.

1. *Committee on Intellectual Co-operation.*—The Committee, approving the proposal of the Committee of Enquiry—which was summarized in the preceding chapter—would ask the Council of the League whether, before appointing new members, it would be possible for it to consult the Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee would also request that its members might be replaced by means of some system of rotation (one-third or one-quarter of the members each year) with a view to ensuring continuity in the work.

2. *Congresses and Conferences.*—It is, of course, understood that, in case of emergency, the Director of the Institute would be authorized to decide on his own responsibility whether the Institute shall or shall not be represented at a Conference or Congress, communicating his decision and reasons to the Executive Committee.

3. *Programme.*—The Committee approves the resumption of the enquiry into the state of intellectual life. This enquiry was begun in 1922 but had to be abandoned, being at that time beyond our means and capacity. It will accordingly be resumed in the form of comparative studies. The method of work will be as follows: the Committee will appoint a committee of experts to draw up the programme of this general enquiry. After approving this programme, the Institute will be instructed to carry out the researches and other work involved, keeping in touch with the committee of experts. The enquiry will thus form part of the Institute's regular activities. The Committee recommends that it should deal primarily with the principles and methods applied in the different countries for all classes of education, including elementary education. The Educational Information Center, or rather both centers at Geneva and Paris respectively, will, of course, be associated with this enquiry, which will provide them with fuller material for their activities—a consideration to which the Committee attaches very great importance.

With regard to the intellectual problems raised outside Europe by the co-existence in the same territory of populations belonging to different civilizations, it is, of course, understood that the populations referred to are those whose civilization differs essentially, either in degree or in nature, and not those which, while belonging to the same civilization, differ in language and race. There are practically no instances in Europe of populations of this kind, and the Committee of

Enquiry, in bringing forward this proposal, had in mind the extension of the general enquiry to cover other continents. The Committee is quite ready to accept this proposal, though it fully realises the great difficulties which such an enquiry will encounter.

It is understood, further, that the proposals of the Committee of Enquiry are intended essentially as examples of what might be attempted, for the field of an enquiry such as this is practically boundless. The proposal that a study should be made of the effects of specialization on general education was, for instance, prompted by the consideration that this problem engaged the attention of the Committee at its first meetings, as may be seen from the 1922 report and that last year Professor Gilbert Murray, the Chairman of the Committee, proposed in a note that the subject should be taken up again. This important question has, of course, already been discussed by many learned bodies, and it will have to be further discussed for years to come before any practical solutions can be reached.

The Committee has placed these subjects on its programme, on the understanding that it may submit them to a committee of experts, which will report on whether they may with advantage be retained. At the same time, it wishes clearly to state its desire that its programme should no longer be limited to purely administrative or technical problems, but should also embrace important questions relating to contemporary life and to the main problem to which all others, even the most specialised, ultimately lead—namely, the problem of civilization.

Turning now to point 5 of the programme, "international protection of intellectual rights," the Committee considers that neither scientific property (incidentally, the term is inaccurate, the rights of a scientist in respect of his discovery being the real point) nor literary or artistic property have been withdrawn from the province of the Paris Institute. On the contrary, the latter will have to follow both these questions very attentively, in close collaboration with organizations such as the Berne Bureaux, the International

Institute for the Unification of Private Law at Rome, the Legal Section of the Secretariat and the International Labour Office. Here, again, the fundamental principle of intellectual co-operation applies—to avoid overlapping and, wherever possible, to institute systematic collaboration with other competent organizations and individuals.

4. *Sub-Committees.*—The plenary Committee would indeed be ungrateful were it to omit a well-deserved tribute to the work of its Sub-Committees. These enabled it, in its early years, to explore a province in which, but for their help, it might so easily have gone astray, and thus to determine in which specific fields it could most usefully exert itself. The Committee owes to these Sub-Committees its programme, its methods and its first achievements. Its proposal that they should now be transformed is explained by the fact that experience has proved that the system of appointing committees of experts is better adapted to its purpose. In order to simplify the organization and to obtain even better results, the Committee suggests replacing the Sub-Committees by committees of experts, between which the programmes would be divided. The Committee desires, nevertheless, to retain, under a different name and with fewer members, the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters. It would form one of the committees of the third type, placed in direct touch with the plenary Committee for the purposes of a preliminary examination of general questions.

5. *Executive Committee.*—This involves a reform of cardinal importance and special explanations are therefore called for.

The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Governing Body of the Institute are, of course, two different organs, composed, however, of the same persons.

The Governing Body appoints, to follow and supervise the Institute's work, a Committee of Directors, consisting of five members chosen from among its own number, and of a Chairman, who is also the Chairman of the Governing Body. The Directors' Committee is therefore an organ emanating from the Governing Body.

A similar organ, emanating, however, from the Committee

on Intellectual Co-operation as such, is now felt to be necessary. The Committee, as noted, meets only once a year, and is no longer able to follow and supervise the whole work of intellectual co-operation. Henceforth, the Executive Committee will be the organ responsible for this. It will consist of eight members, five chosen from among members of the Committee and three from outside the Committee. This was the system followed in selecting the Committee of Enquiry, and the latter's work has proved it to be excellent.

The Committee and the Governing Body being composed of the same persons, it is only logical that this should also be the case with the Executive Committee and the Directors' Committee.

Since, however, the members of the Directors' Committee apart from its Chairman, are to number only five, the three members chosen from outside the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, and consequently from outside the Governing Body will be called upon to attend the meetings of the Directors' Committee only in an advisory capacity.

The Executive Committee and the Directors' Committee will be presided over respectively by the Chairman of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and the Chairman of the Governing Body, who are members *ipso facto* of the Executive and Directors' Committees. There will be two separate agendas, for the Directors' Committee and the Executive Committee, respectively.

The unity essential to an organ of such importance for the continuous growth of intellectual operation will thus be guaranteed.

The system of substitute members, it should be added, is to be abolished.

The Committee felt it necessary to appoint the members of the Executive Committee without further delay. Subject to official approval, these members are as follows: MME. CURIE, M. CASARES, M. DESTRÉE, M. DE REYNOLD, M. ROCCO, SIR FRANK HEATH, DR. KRÜSS and M. ROLAND-MARCEL, the last three being chosen from outside the Committee.

6. *Committees of Experts.*—It is, of course, understood that the ordinary, typical committee of experts is a committee sitting at the Institute, in accordance with the definition given in the first paragraph of this section. The other committees, especially those of the second type, may be set up under exceptional circumstances. Lastly, all committees of experts, of whatever type, to which questions already submitted to the Institute are referred, will be placed in direct touch with the Institute.

7. *National Committees.*—The slight modifications which the Committee has made in the text of paragraphs (*d*) and (*e*) indicate that it does not regard the National Committees as the sole means of ensuring liaison between the International Committee and the official intellectual authorities in the different countries, but as one of the means of ensuring such liaison.

8. *International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation.*—In deleting the statement which deprives the Institute of all autonomous action and pointing out simply that the Institute must not engage in any fresh activity involving a question of principle, the Committee desired to stress the point that the Institute must enjoy, within the limits laid down for it, that freedom of action without which it could not work. The Institute's dependence upon the Committee is made sufficiently clear in the preceding part of the report.

9. *Name of the Institute.*—The Committee agrees with the Committee of Enquiry that the name of the Institute was ill-chosen and was bound to be the initial cause of misunderstanding and criticism. The name is, however, consecrated by usage and any attempt to change it now would be just as dangerous.

10. "*Délégués d'Etat*".—The Délégués d'Etat are in principle retained; that is to say, the Governments can, if they think it advisable, appoint delegates to follow the work of the Institute. The relations of such delegates with the Institute would be on purely individual lines.

11. *Re-organisation of the Institute.*—Instead of abolishing the sections, the Committee submits the following proposal:

The allocation of work and distribution of staff should be adapted to the plan of work, avoiding any rigidity in the internal organization of the Institute.

It should be remembered in this connection that the internal division of the Institute into clearly defined sections was designed to suit the first stage of intellectual co-operation activities. In 1924-25, when the Committee was engaged in what might be called a general exploration of its field of action, it instituted Sub-Committees to deal with University Questions, Intellectual Rights, Science and Bibliography and, somewhat later, Arts and Letters. It seemed quite natural to organize the Institute in accordance with this particular allocation. Now, however, while remaining sufficiently firm in structure, the Institute must be re-adapted to meet the requirements of this new situation, but the Committee leaves it to the Executive and Directors' Committee to make the necessary administrative changes.

12. *Relations of the Secretariat of the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation with the Institute.*—The texts of the two new paragraphs framed to supplement the regulations adopted in 1926 by the Governing Body have been amended to bring them into line with the Statute, which explicitly authorizes the Institute to get in touch with the governmental and administrative authorities in the different countries. The texts as amended read:

10. Members of Committees of Experts shall be appointed by the Chairman of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, on the proposal of the Secretary, who shall previously consult the Director of the Institute. The latter shall, as far as possible, consult the National Committees.

11. The Secretariat shall be informed of any correspondence that the Institute, under its Statutes, may be authorized to carry on with governmental and administrative authorities.

After each session of the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, the Secretariat shall reach an agreement with the Institute as to the allocation of work in accordance with the provisions of the resolutions adopted by

the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation and approved by the Council and the Assembly.

13. *Publications.*—Here the Committee thought it preferable to rely on the Executive and Directors' Committees. The latter will have to take into consideration proposals submitted by the Sub-Committee on Science and Bibliography, concerning the Lists of Notable Books, and by the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters, concerning the Spanish-American classics.

The Committee also approved the proposal that the review *La Coopération intellectuelle* should be transformed into an information bulletin bearing the same title.

14. *Conclusions.*—For questions relating to the budget, reference is invited to the report of the Governing Body, and appended hereunder will be found simply the Committee's text with reference to the general conclusions:

The work of intellectual co-operation is sound and practicable, as is shown by the results already achieved in spite of all difficulties. The League of Nations may therefore expect a great deal from it in future.

It is necessary, however, to simplify it, to improve the methods of work and the machinery and, without restricting the general scope of the Institute's activities, to draw up an immediate programme containing only a small number of questions of immediate interest or of undoubted importance within the financial resources available.

The inevitable crisis in its early development will thus be safely overpassed after the experiments which had to be made and which, all things considered, will prove to have been of advantage.

The resignation of M. Julien Luchaire, Director of the Institute—though this does not deprive the Intellectual Co-operation Organization of his collaboration—and the appointment of M. Henri Bonnet as his successor are events of such importance that they cannot be omitted at the close of this chapter, although they are actually referred to in the Governing Body's report. The Committee learns also that it will probably be losing the services of its devoted Secretary, M. G. Oprescu, who has been appointed to the University of Bucharest.

III. SUB-COMMITTEES

In order to avoid unduly extending this report, we shall deal as briefly as possible with the work of the Sub-Committees. We do not propose to go into details inviting reference to the text of the resolutions annexed hereto. We shall confine ourselves to noting the results achieved, the points in the programme on which attention should be concentrated in future and the methods which it is proposed to employ. The International Committee, moreover, when examining the resolutions submitted to it, viewed them from the standpoint of the reforms which it desires itself to recommend. It accordingly accepted some of them outright, while eliminating others; it referred the majority to the Executive and Directors' Committees which are entrusted by the Institute with the execution of the programme of intellectual co-operation. The value of the Sub-Committees will have been demonstrated by the time they have concluded their activities as such, and the results they have achieved themselves reveal the necessity of replacing them by committees of experts.

1. The work of the *Sub-Committee of Experts for the Instruction of Youth* has developed to such an extent that, in order to give effect to the Sub-Committee's resolutions, it has become necessary to attach a special official to the Intellectual Co-operation Section of the Secretariat and similarly to extend the Institute's educational information center. This particular field, as was clear from the outset, has proved to be particularly fertile and calls for more intensive culture within the scope assigned to it in general by the Council and Assembly. The Sub-Committee, it may be noted, proposes to convene a meeting of experts to determine whether it would be possible to include in the agenda the question of school text-books, particularly history and geography books. This is a very real means of promoting reciprocal understanding between peoples—one of the first aims of intellectual co-operation—and justifies the examination of a problem the delicacy and difficulty of which everyone realizes.

2. The same applies to the *Sub-Committee on Intellectual Rights*—not that there can be any hope in this case of achieving immediate results, since the problem at the moment is to define such rights and encourage certain ideas, a task demanding both time and patience. The moment has come, however, to take the first step towards bridging the gulf between theory and practice. The Sub-Committee and the international associations concerned have paid a generous tribute to the work of the Paris Institute, but as these are problems calling particularly for the collaboration of the competent bodies, we recommend that a conference should be convened, as soon as possible, between representatives of the Paris Institute and of those institutions which have specialised in intellectual rights and cognate legal problems: the Berne Bureaux, the Institute for the Unification of Private Law at Rome, the Legal Section of the Secretariat and the International Labour Office. The conference would be attended by a representative of the Committee, who might even be asked to preside over it. In the view of the Committee, a conference of this sort would in no way encroach upon the domain of the Paris Institute, but would be bound, as is desired by the Sub-Committee, to stimulate it and provide material for its activities.

3. The chief problem confronting the *Sub-Committee on Science and Bibliography* is the co-ordination of libraries and of the questions relating thereto: *Guide to National Information Services, Loan Systems and International Exchanges;* International Exchange of Publications; Code of Abbreviations of Titles of Periodicals; Second Edition of the *Index Bibliographicus*, etc.

This question is in the forefront of the new programme, for it concerns the learned world as a whole, which means that for the next few years a systematic effort will have to be made in this direction, so that the Committee of Library Experts must continue to meet. The Committee proposes that M. Collijn and M. Sevensma, President and Secretary respectively of the International Federation of Librarians' Associations, should be asked to sit on the Library Committee.

4. *The Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters* also has two important achievements to record, in the matter of museography and popular arts respectively. The first is represented by the *International Museums Office* and the second by the *International Committee of Popular Arts*.

The International Museums Office grew up within the framework of the Intellectual Co-operation Organization and of the Institute and has no intention of acting independently. Within this framework, it actually possesses an organization which has been put to the test and proved its excellence. Its various activities—the publication of *Mouseion*, the *International List of Museums*, the *List of Works of Art existing in Fragments*, the international exhibition of casts, the international chalcographical exhibitions, the agreements between chalcographical workshops, the meeting of experts to study scientific methods for the examination, restoration and preservation of works of art—have been singularly successful and for further progress require only the relative degree of autonomy requested by the Office itself. The latter, it may be noted, is the only institution of the kind at present in existence.

The situation as regards the International Committee of Popular Arts, however, is somewhat different. The suggestion that something should be done in this domain came from the Sub-Committee: there was the Prague Congress in 1928 and the Committee is the outcome of that Congress. It has thus been more or less detached from the Intellectual Co-operation Organization and from the Institute. It now has to be brought into closer touch with its origin under an agreement the main lines of which were framed by the Sub-Committee and have been approved by the plenary Committee.

The Sub-Committee's activities in the matter of letters have assumed a concrete form in connection with translations, an essentially international aspect of literature. Here, again, a Committee of Experts, acting in conjunction with the Institute and employing the data already collected by the latter, will complete the work of clearing the ground.

Reference has already been made to the Committee's

desire to retain the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters in some other form. In this case, a meeting of experts would not suffice: on the contrary, it requires a bigger and more representative meeting to bring out the synthetic aspect of arts and letters, the relations between which are so very close. The Committee would be very loth to deprive itself of organs in which—as happened during the Sub-Committee's meetings—minds of worldwise grasp can exchange their views on civilization, modern man and contemporary life in general.

5. The activities of the *Sub-Committee on University Relations* consist not so much in studying new problems as in pursuing two categories of work that are being carried out to a very large extent by and at the Institute. There are, on the one hand, the meetings now held periodically, which it is most important to continue—for example, of representatives of the National University Offices, of representatives of the International Students' Organizations, of the Conference of Institutes for the Scientific Study of International Relations and, later, after a preparatory meeting, of the Directors of higher education. On the other hand, there is the preparation and publication of year-books—for example, the year-books of international scholarships and of holiday courses—which may appear to supply a very modest need as actual sources of information and practical help, but which render real services to students, teachers and learned circles all over the world.

The conclusion of this report will be as brief as the report itself had perforce to be.

The Committee unanimously trusts that the Assembly and Council will think fit to approve its proposals. It is unanimously convinced that the future of intellectual co-operation depends on their acceptance. The reforms and programme of work set out in this report and in its appendices are the fruit of years of experience and prolonged study, followed by exhaustive discussion. The time has now come to emerge from a period of waiting and to enter upon one in which the proposed measures shall be applied, so far as possible, in their integrity.

The American Way

WE, THE people of the United States, have been experimenting for one hundred and fifty years to create conditions in which every citizen finds opportunity for maximum individual growth. A large amount of success has attended our efforts. America is justly known as the land of opportunity, though the chances for individual growth are not yet equitably open to all. We are still experimenting.

The complexity of modern life renders this experimentation increasingly difficult and proportionately vital to the future. We are, however, better equipped now to cope with increasing difficulties. For out of the wealth of experience has emerged a conviction that this maximum individual growth is the key to a higher civilization. This conviction finds expression in the following working hypothesis:

Human talents are distributed through the whole people in such a way that civilization advances farther the more completely the latent creative talents of all the people are discovered and constructively developed.

The peoples of antiquity were handicapped in perfecting civilization on this basis because their institutions were designed and operated to serve a special group or class. Therefore, their institutions expressed a partial or biased point of view that emphasized discovery and development of particular attitudes and skills in special groups of the people. Hence, many of the essential elements of advancing civilization were neglected, resulting in a lopsided or unbalanced civilization. Each such unbalanced civilization achieved greatness of some special sort and then decayed, giving Spengler grounds for his pessimistic prediction of ultimate dissolution. None of the empires he considered ever tried to encourage the people to discover and develop all their latent talents.

This same handicap inevitably limits contemporary nations

in which the institutions of government or of education are designed and operated to serve a special group or class. The chances of discovering and developing all the talents of all the people are then restricted by the inevitable limitations of a special group of men. The basic hypothesis just stated can never be thoroughly tested by organizations of this type.

The United States, on the other hand, is in a particularly fortunate position to test the basic hypothesis experimentally for the following reasons:

The institutions of government and of education in the United States were ordained and established to serve all the people. America's enduring faith in the validity and the practicability of this purpose gives both public sanction and dynamic drive to continuing experimentation directed toward its fuller achievement.

The political organization in the United States is designed to promote such continuing experimentation. It consists of 48 major units with a common central or federal agency of cooperation and united action. Each of these 48 units is free to act independently within very wide limits. Each has its own characteristic temperament, traditions, environment, and view point. Experimentation designed to discover how political mechanisms can contribute most toward liberating the creative talents of all people can therefore proceed simultaneously from 48 different points of view, thus increasing the chances of success. The central agency of cooperation can give consistency to the whole.

Similarly, the school system is so organized as to facilitate such continuing experimentation. The public schools are operated in 48 major groups with some 120,000 local units, all of which are comparatively free to experiment independently. Privately controlled institutions are wholly free to experiment. Therefore, although the bias of group or class may affect experimentation in any one of these units, the experiments of all groups would certainly discover and develop a greater and more varied range of human talents. An adequate central agency of cooperation has not yet been created, though there are many public and voluntary organizations through which considerable consistency is secured.

In like manner, organizations in the working world are wholly free to experiment. And since control is vested in a large number of independent groups with different points of view, the individual differences among experimenting groups

are large, so that the dangers of group or class bias are correspondingly reduced. The central agencies for cooperation in this field are well developed and are rapidly becoming more effective.

The American people have established and are maintaining such institutions of public service in various other areas of experience. But these three examples are probably sufficient to indicate why the manner in which we do this creates conditions favorable to experimental test of the basis hypothesis. If we, the people, continue to guide the evolution of these institutions of public service so that they ever more fully help all people discover and develop their own creative talents, we are not only looking toward fuller realization of America's ideal of maximum individual growth; we are also expressing America's conviction that this is the best way to an ever improving and enduring civilization.

Being practical idealists, Americans know how to meet a challenge like this. They first express their ideals in terms of specific acts to be performed by each institution when operating effectively to help people grow. They then make the institution act according to the specification, and analyze the consequences to discover critical factors of success and failure. They then adjust performance to secure more ideal consequences, and so on.

For example, the following statements define American ideals as to how political, educational, and occupational institutions operate when they best help people discover and develop their own creative talents.

Political Institutions.—Create and maintain conditions of continuing order, stability, and confidence that encourage people to initiate and carry on constructive enterprises.

Umpire controversies between individuals or groups in such manner as to secure progressively more responsible self-government and more enlightened cooperation among all concerned.

Educational Institutions.—Coach children in skillful use of the tools of social living and creative work in team-play for the common welfare.

Create and maintain a school program and environment that stimulate cooperative action, inspire a disinterested passion for excellence and instill a scale of real social values.

Occupational Institutions.—Supply material necessities and comforts of life in a manner that is profitable to the operators and continually raises the standards of living for all.

Organize the world's work so that all may be steadily employed, each according to capacity, in work that gives both scope for self-education on the job and rewards commensurate with achievement.

Similar statements may be set up by the same process for the major institutions in other areas of experience. Such statements direct attention to the effects we want these institutions to have on people. They indicate what kinds of questions lead to isolation of the factors that are critical to success or failure in helping people discover and develop their talents through cooperative enterprises for the common weal. Thus they are effective criteria for determining what information is really significant in appraising the results achieved and in analyzing and perfecting the operations of the institutions that we, the people, have ordained and established to help us grow.

As an example of the application of these ideals as criteria for selecting significant factors, consider the Indians. In order of their presentation above, these statements suggest critical questions like these:

What constructive enterprises have Indians initiated and developed since they have been under federal regulation?

In what ways is the Indian increasing in powers of responsible self-government and intelligent cooperation because of his treatment by the State?

What are the common tools of social living for Indians? To what extent do schools help Indian children acquire skillful use of these tools in effective team play?

To what extent do present school practices create and maintain an environment that stimulates expression of the constructive capacities of Indian children?

In what ways are the standards of living among Indians rising because of their industrial activities?

What kinds of constructive work do Indians do? How far does that work give scope for self-education on the job?

By thus applying the foregoing criteria, significant questions of this sort may be selected for study instead of such questions as:

How many Indians are there?
Are their numbers increasing?
How are they distributed?
How far is the Government protecting their rights?
How many children of school age are there?
How many days schooling per year?
What is the ratio of attendance to enrollment?
How does the curriculum compare with that of public schools?
What is the median cost per student year?
How do teachers' salaries compare with those in public schools?

Answers to the second set of questions, while interesting and useful, are not fundamental. They give little critical data that can be used to improve the practical workings of our institutions. Answers to the first set, on the other hand, enable us to determine how well the institutions we have established deliver goods that measure up to the specifications. We can then intelligently modify their mechanisms so as to make them do a better job. Working in this truly American way, under the favorable conditions prevalent in the United States, we can, if we will, build an ever better world.

C. R. MANN.

The California Junior College Mental-Educational Survey

Extent and Method of the Survey. The most extensive mental-educational survey of students in junior colleges yet made was carried through in California in the college year 1929-30.[1] In the autumn of 1929 the ability and achievement of over eleven thousand students in forty-seven junior colleges were measured by means of two nationally known standard tests.[2] More than seven thousand junior college freshmen and over twenty-four hundred sophomores were tested; special students and lower division students in one four-year junior college brought up the grand total to over 11,000. The tests were given to approximately two-thirds of all the junior college students in the state; to over two-thirds of the freshmen, and to over one-half of the sophomores.

Data are available from which it is possible to make comparisons of the scores of California junior college students on both the Thurstone and the Iowa tests, with those made by students in four-year colleges and universities in the United States as a whole.

[1] With the aid of grants from the American Council on Education and the Council for Research in Social Sciences at Stanford University. A more extensive report of this survey has been published as Bulletin J-3, by the California State Department of Education, 61 pp., Sacramento, 1930.

[2] The two tests selected for the survey were the *Psychological Examination for High School Graduates and College Freshmen, 1928 edition* (referred to hereafter more briefly as the "Thurstone Test"), prepared by L. L. Thurstone and Thelma Gwinn Thurstone, and published by the American Council on Education, which has been widely used in four-year colleges and universities throughout the country; and the *Iowa High School Content Examination, Form B* (referred to hereafter as the "Iowa test"), by G. M. Ruch, G. D. Stoddard, Lonzo Jones, and Nell Maupin, which covers by 400 multiple-choice questions the general fields of English language and literature, mathematics, science, history and social science. The Thurstone test requires sixty minutes of working time, the Iowa test eighty minutes. As far as possible the colleges were asked to give both tests on the same half-day, within two weeks of the opening of college, the Thurstone test first, with a ten-minute intermission before giving the Iowa test.

Thurstone Test—Freshmen.—The American Council on Education reports briefly the results of giving the 1928 edition of the Thurstone test to 30,653 freshmen in 112 colleges in the United States.[3] Median and quartile scores and comparisons with similar data for the California groups are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF MEDIAN AND QUARTILE SCORES OF FRESHMEN IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES AND IN NATIONAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ON THE THURSTONE TEST

GROUP	Number of colleges	Number of students	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Inter-quartile range
National Four-Year Colleges	**112**	**30,653**	**99**	**138**	**179**	**80**
Public	32	13,409	96	129	170	74
Private	80	17,244	105	145	186	81
California Junior Colleges	**45**	**6,279**	**101**	**135**	**171**	**70**
District	15	3,653	103	137	174	71
High School	16	2,021	97	129	165	68
Private	9	208	107	136	164	57
Special	5	397	104	143	182	78

The California group as a whole scores slightly lower on the Thurstone test than the entire national group of colleges. But since 96 per cent of the California group are in public junior colleges it may be more significant to compare them with the 13,000 freshmen in 32 public colleges and universities. When this is done, it is seen that the California junior college group shows considerable superiority to the public colleges, and corresponding inferiority to the private colleges. These differences are at least in part explained by factors affecting the enrollment in the several types of institutions. The junior colleges and most of the public institutions are open to all who may come. On the other hand, there is a considerable degree of selection due to limitation of enrollment in many of the private institutions in the country. The California students form a more homogeneous group, as is shown by the smaller spread of the middle 50 per cent (interquartile range) than is the case of students enrolled in the four-year colleges.

[3] Thurstone, L. L., and Thurstone, T. G., "Psychological Examination for 1928"; in *Educational Record* (April, 1929).

While the differences between groups are not noticeable, as judged by the median scores, it is impossible to judge the true significance of the differences due to the absence of probable errors. Table 2, therefore, exhibits mean scores, with their probable errors, for the national and California groups.

TABLE 2.—COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR FRESHMEN IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES AND IN NATIONAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ON THE THURSTONE TEST

GROUP	Number of students	Mean score	P. E. of mean
National Colleges	30,053	140.65	0.20*
Public	13,409	132.62	0.30*
Private	17,244	146.88	0.26*
California Junior Colleges	8,279	137.47	0.43
District	3,653	139.66	0.58
High School	2,021	132.18	0.73
Private	208	138.27	2.20
Special	397	143.87	1.78

* Thurstone does not give these values. They have been computed by the author on the assumption that the standard deviation (sigma) is the same for the national group as for the California group, 50.74.

Here again the mean score of the entire California group is seen to be significantly lower than that of the entire national group, but even more significantly superior to the national public group. Each of the California groups is superior to the national public group, except the high high school type of junior college which differs from it but slightly.

Iowa Test—Freshmen.—Extensive data are not available for similar national comparisons on the Iowa test, but comparisons may be made with freshmen at the University of Iowa. This is done in Table 3.

TABLE 3.—COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR LOW FRESHMEN IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES AND IN THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA ON THE IOWA TEST

GROUP	Number of students	Mean score	Sigma	P. E. of mean
University of Iowa	1,134	181.2	50.0*	1.0
California Junior Colleges	6,918	178.5	49.4	0.4
District	3,228	180.0	50.3	0.6
High School	2,084	173.3	47.0	0.7
Private	208	186.6	47.9	2.2
Special	398	189.4	52.2	1.8

* Approximate.

The entire group of low freshmen of California junior college students stands slightly lower on the Iowa test than the University of Iowa freshmen, but the difference is not significant. The California high school type of junior college, however, is distinctly lower.

Tests of Sophomores.—The number of low sophomores tested was sufficiently large to make similar comparisons between the different groups fairly significant. These are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4.—COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR LOW SOPHOMORES ON THURSTONE AND IOWA TESTS

GROUP	Number	Mean	Sigma	P. E. of mean
Thurstone Test—All	2,043	158.4	51.9	0.8
District	1,572	157.8	51.4	0.9
High School	196	158.6	52.5	2.5
Private	98	150.5	56.3	3.8
Special	177	168.3	51.8	2.6
Iowa Test—All	2,045	196.4	49.6	0.7
District	1,568	194.7	48.8	0.8
High School	204	201.1	50.5	2.4
Private	97	193.0	52.8	3.6
Special	176	207.6	52.0	2.6

Table 4 shows test results which are markedly different than those which were shown in Tables 2 and 3. In both tests the low sophomores of the high school type of junior college made higher mean scores than did the district type of junior college students. The difference in mean score is too slight to be significant in the case of the Thurstone test, but is distinctly significant in the case of the Iowa test. Is the freshman instruction superior in the smaller high school type of junior college, or is the elimination of the poorer students more rapid, so that only the better students survived to take the tests as sophomores? Either hypothesis would serve to explain the striking difference between the freshman and sophomore results, but unfortunately the tests do not furnish an answer to either question; they only raise the question. That the elimination of students is an important factor, however, is shown by the fact that the sophomore

enrollment of October 1, 1929, in the high school type of junior colleges, was only 45 per cent of the freshman enrollment in the same institutions at the same time during the preceding year; while in the district type of junior colleges the corresponding figure was 65 per cent. The district type institutions held two-thirds of their freshmen, the high school type less than one-half. These facts suggest that the superiority of score shown by the high school type of junior college sophomores may be due to more rapid elimination of the inferior students during or at the end of the freshman year.

Comparisons by Classes.—At Pasadena, where a partial six-four-four plan of organization is in effect, the tests were given to 1218 "lower division" or 11th and 12th grade students as well as to the freshmen and sophomores in junior college classes. Comparative scores can thus be given by half-year intervals from the low eleventh grade to the junior college high sophomores. This is done in Table 5.

TABLE 5.—COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY CLASSES, THURSTONE AND IOWA TESTS

CLASS	Number	Mean	Sigma	P. E. of mean
Thurstone Test—				
Low Eleventh	473	106.2	47.7	1.5
High Eleventh	165	115.7	47.2	2.5
Low Twelfth	375	126.6	48.0	1.7
High Twelfth	131	127.7	54.7	3.2
Low Freshmen	6,279	137.5	50.7	0.4
High Freshmen	832	144.2	52.9	1.2
Low Sophomores	2,043	158.4	51.9	0.8
High Sophomores	395	159.0	51.2	1.7
Specials	270	131.6	52.9	2.2
Iowa Test—				
Low Eleventh	473	144.6	45.6	1.4
High Eleventh	165	157.9	45.5	2.4
Low Twelfth	375	168.3	50.0	1.7
High Twelfth	131	175.8	58.0	3.4
Low Freshmen	5,918	178.5	49.4	0.4
High Freshmen	835	184.6	51.0	1.2
Low Sophomores	2,045	196.4	49.6	0.7
High Sophomores	397	201.5	46.8	1.6
Specials	261	167.0	56.1	2.3

There is a constant though somewhat irregular increase in score from class to class. The mean scores of the two freshman groups are but slightly different in either test, and this

is also true of the scores made by the two sophomore groups. On both tests, however, the mean scores of the sophomore groups are considerably higher than those of the freshmen. The inferior freshmen apparently tend to be eliminated to a considerable extent before the sophomore year. If the differences shown in Table 5 were due entirely or even largely to added maturity, the differences between the mean scores of successive classes should be approximately equal. The differences between high freshman and low sophomore score are two or three times as great as those between other groups separated by half-year intervals. This fact supports the elimination hypothesis previously stated.

Comparisons by Sex.—Separate studies by sex were made for the largest and most significant group, the low freshmen. These are summarized for the Thurstone test in Table 6.

TABLE 6.—COMPARISON OF SCORES OF LOW FRESHMEN ON THE THURSTONE TEST, BY SEXES

GROUP	Men			Women		
	Number	Mean score	P. E. of mean	Number	Mean score	P. E. of mean
All	**3,444**	**138.0**	**0.6**	**2,835**	**136.8**	**0.6**
District	1,964	139.9	0.8	1,689	139.3	0.8
High School	1,115	133.0	1.0	906	131.2	1.1
Private	123	145.2	2.8	85	128.3	3.5
Special	242	141.6	5.4	155	147.4	2.7

The chief fact of interest shown by Table 6 is that as a whole the Thurstone test does not reveal significant sex differences. The situation is strikingly different in the case of the Iowa test, as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7.—COMPARISON OF SCORES OF LOW FRESHMEN ON THE IOWA TEST, BY SEXES

GROUP	Men			Women			Difference	
	Number	Mean	P. E. of mean	Number	Mean	P. E. of mean	Amount	P. E.
All	**3,243**	**188.4**	**0.6**	**2,675**	**166.5**	**0.6**	**21.9**	**0.8**
District	1,745	189.2	0.8	1,483	169.1	0.8	20.1	1.1
High School	1,132	184.4	0.9	952	160.1	1.0	24.3	1.3
Private	123	200.9	2.6	85	165.8	3.4	35.1	4.3
Special	243	194.8	2.4	155	180.9	2.5	13.9	3.3

A glance at the last column of Table 7 shows that there are large and significant differences in mean scores in favor of the men in every group tested. This superiority of the men in the Iowa test score is found in all but four of the individual institutions involved. In only one of the four does the number of women tested exceed five. The implication of Table 7 is clear. The Iowa test can not be used safely for individual diagnosis and guidance without taking into account sex differences on the test. As far as known, norms for the two sexes have never been published.[4]

Part Scores.—Since the Iowa test shows such striking differences, it will be instructive to consider the sex differences on the four component parts of the test. Do the men make superior scores in all four fields? The answer to this question will be found in Table 8. An analysis on the basis of sex has also been made for two of the parts of the Thurstone test, namely those testing knowledge of arithmetic and artificial language.

TABLE 8.—COMPARISON OF SCORES OF LOW FRESHMEN ON THE FOUR PARTS OF THE IOWA TEST AND ON TWO OF THE PARTS OF THE THURSTONE TEST, BY SEXES

	Men			Women			Difference in favor of
	Number	Mean	P. E. of mean	Number	Mean	P. E. of mean	
Iowa Test—							
English	3,453	49.9	0.2	2,880	55.3	0.2	Women
Mathematics	3,453	34.7	0.2	2,880	25.2	0.2	Men
Science	3,453	47.7	0.2	2,880	35.6	0.1	Men
History	*3,243	57.7	0.2	*2,675	52.2	0.2	Men
Thurstone Test—							
Arithmetic	†3,236	29.6	0.2	2,632	21.9	0.2	Men
Artificial Language	†3,236	22.8	0.1	2,632	29.5	0.2	Women

*Students at Sacramento did not take the history section of the Iowa test.

†Part scores on the Thurstone test were not furnished by Sacramento or Fresno.

[4] Detailed percentile sex norms based on the California junior college scores will be found for the entire test and the four parts of it in Bulletin J-3, *California Junior College Mental-Educational Survey*. Sacramento, California, 1930.

TABLE 9.—CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE NORMS, BY CLASSES. THURSTONE PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION—1928 EDITION

(NOTE.—National norms for low freshmen based on 112 public and private colleges and universities are inserted, in blackface in the third column. All others are California norms, based on the present survey.)

	Low freshmen		High freshmen N=832	Low sophomores N=2,043	High sophomores N=395	Specials N=270
	California N=6,279	National N=30,653				
Mean	137.5	140.6	144.2	158.4	159.0	131.6
Sigma	50.7	.....	52.9	51.9	51.2	52.9
Q_3	171	179	182	194	194	167
Med	135	138	143	158	158	129
Q_1	101	99	105	122	121	93
Percentile scores						
345	.....	.999	.....	.....	.....	.....
335	.....	.999	.....	.9998	.....	.....
325	.....	.999	.999	.999	.....	.....
315	.9998	.999	.999	.999	.999	.....
305	.999	.998	.998	.998	.998	.....
295	.999	.997	.998	.995	.996	.....
285	.998	.995	.993	.991	.991	.....
275	.996	.992	.990	.987	.984	.998
265	.992	.986	.986	.979	.971	.996
255	.986	.977	.977	.966	.956	.994
245	.977	.964	.968	.950	.943	.991
235	.965	.947	.959	.929	.928	.976
225	.947	.926	.939	.898	.903	.948
215	.924	.897	.902	.857	.866	.922
205	.896	.864	.863	.808	.814	.893
195	.862	.824	.821	.754	.754	.857
185	.821	.778	.767	.698	.695	.826
175	.771	.726	.714	.632	.633	.787
165	.712	.669	.659	.553	.560	.741
155	.645	.608	.590	.475	.473	.687
145	.574	.544	.518	.401	.405	.611
135	.500	.479	.442	.330	.346	.537
125	.426	.413	.369	.265	.276	.476
115	.352	.349	.308	.208	.205	.393
105	.279	.287	.251	.160	.142	.315
95	.213	.228	.198	.116	.085	.261
85	.157	.174	.141	.081	.065	.206
75	.110	.126	.096	.055	.048	.148
65	.070	.086	.067	.036	.033	.111
55	.042	.054	.039	.023	.015	.080
45	.023	.030	.018	.012	.005	.048
35	.011	.014	.009	.004	.003	.026
25	.004	.005	.003	.001	.001	.007
15	.001	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

It will be noted that in every one of the six part-tests tabulated marked and highly significant differences exist between the scores of men and women. The women excel in English and artificial language, the men in the other fields

TABLE 10.—CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE NORMS, BY CLASSES. IOWA HIGH SCHOOL CONTENT EXAMINATION—FORM B

SCORE	Low freshmen N=5,918	High freshmen N=835	Low sophomores N=2,045	High sophomores N=397	Specials N=261
Mean	178.5	184.6	196.4	201.5	167.0
Sigma	49.4	51.0	49.6	46.8	56.1
Q_3	212	218	232	233	207
Med	177	184	196	203	162
Q_1	143	149	162	170	127
Percentile scores					
365	.....	.999	.....	.....	.....
355	.9999	.998	.9995	.....	.....
345	.9998	.998	.999	.....	.....
335	.9996	.997	.998	.999	.....
325	.999	.996	.997	.995	.....
315	.997	.995	.994	.989	.....
305	.993	.990	.988	.981	.....
295	.987	.983	.977	.976	.994
285	.980	.971	.961	.962	.987
275	.970	.956	.938	.946	.970
265	.954	.938	.909	.923	.947
255	.934	.907	.876	.875	.927
245	.905	.869	.830	.825	.895
235	.868	.835	.768	.768	.860
225	.821	.792	.704	.693	.824
215	.766	.734	.644	.607	.787
205	.702	.662	.577	.515	.743
195	.633	.583	.503	.426	.690
185	.560	.507	.428	.349	.642
175	.486	.440	.346	.282	.584
165	.410	.365	.269	.220	.523
155	.334	.290	.209	.175	.456
145	.263	.228	.156	.130	.370
135	.201	.169	.110	.086	.291
125	.146	.120	.070	.055	.238
115	.100	.083	.046	.032	.184
105	.064	.055	.032	.019	.134
95	.038	.034	.018	.011	.096
85	.022	.018	.010	.006	.063
75	.010	.011	.006	.002	.042
65	.005	.007	.002	.000	.029
55	.002	.004	.001	.....	.017
45	.001	.002	.000	.....	.008
35	.000	.001	.000	.....	.002
25	.000	.001	.....	.....	.000
15	.....	.001	.....	.....	.....
5	.....	.000	.....	.....	.....

measured by these particular tests. The differences revealed appear to be sufficiently significant to render the use of the part-scores of value in programs of guidance. These differences should also be taken into consideration in comparisons of student achievement in coeducational institutions or in those in which enrollment is limited either to men or to women.

Percentile Norms by Classes.—Detailed percentile norms and other summary facts for the California junior college groups are shown in Table 9 for the Thurstone test and in Table 10 for the Iowa test.

TABLE 11.—CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE NORMS: LOW FRESHMEN PART SCORES, BY SEXES. THURSTONE PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION, 1928 EDITION

	Arithmetic			Artificial language	
	Men, N=3,236	Women, N=2,632		Men, N=3,236	Women, N=2,632
Mean	29.6	21.9	Mean	22.8	29.8
Sigma	12.6	11.2	Sigma	11.0	12.9
Q_3	38	29	Q_3	29	37
Med.	29	21	Med.	22	28
Q_1	21	13	Q_1	15	21
Percentile scores			Percentile scores		
80	.9998	.....	73	.9998	.999
			71	.999	.996
78	.9997	.....	69	.998	.994
			67	.997	.992
74	.9994	.9998	65	.996	.990
			63	.995	.987
70	.998	.999	61	.994	.982
			59	.992	.977
66	.995	.999	57	.991	.971
			55	.989	.962
62	.989	.998			
			53	.986	.951
58	.982	.998	51	.983	.969
			49	.978	.949
54	.968	.994	47	.970	.893
			45	.961	.870
50	.941	.987			
			43	.949	.845
46	.899	.973	41	.934	.818
			39	.919	.785
			37	.900	.749
42	.840	.949	35	.876	.720
			33	.851	.664
38	.756	.909	31	.815	.607
			29	.758	.539
34	.647	.852	27	.691	.463
			25	.623	.389
30	.524	.770			
			23	.552	.325
26	.402	.667	21	.480	.262
			19	.400	.205
			17	.319	.154
22	.288	.540	15	.242	.112
			13	.175	.082
18	.187	.400	11	.121	.057
			9	.077	.036
14	.110	.274	7	.046	.022
			5	.030	.013
10	.056	.155			
			3	.019	.007
6	.022	.060	1	.006	.002
2	.004	.011			

Percentile Norms by Sexes.—Similarly percentile norms and related facts are shown for the two sexes in Table 11 for two of the parts of the Thurstone test, and in Table 12 for the four parts of the Iowa test.

TABLE 12.—CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE NORMS: LOW FRESHMEN PART SCORES, BY SEXES. IOWA HIGH SCHOOL CONTENT EXAMINATION—FORM B

	English		Mathematics		Science		History	
	Men 3,453	Women 2,880	Men 3,453	Women 2,880	Men 3,453	Women 2,880	Men 3,243	Women 2,675
Mean	49.9	55.3	34.7	25.2	47.7	35.6	57.7	52.2
Sigma	18.1	18.4	14.9	12.3	14.4	10.9	15.5	14.5
Q_3	62	69	46	32	58	43	68	63
Med.	48	54	33	24	47	35	58	52
Q_1	36	41	23	16	36	28	47	42
Percentile scores								
112.5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
107.5	.999	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.999	.....
102.5	.998	.998	.....	.....	.....	.....	.998	.....
97.5	.995	.99	.....	.....	.999	.....	.996	.999
92.5	.99	.98	.....	.....	.998	.....	.99	.998
87.5	.97	.95	.....	.....	.998	.....	.97	.99
82.5	.95	.92	.....	.....	.99	.....	.94	.98
77.5	.92	.87	.....	.....	.98	.....	.90	.96
72.5	.88	.81	.999	.999	.95	.999	.83	.91
67.5	.82	.73	.99	.996	.90	.995	.73	.84
62.5	.76	.65	.96	.99	.84	.98	.62	.76
57.5	.67	.56	.91	.98	.75	.97	.50	.64
52.5	.58	.46	.85	.96	.64	.93	.37	.52
47.5	.48	.36	.78	.94	.52	.85	.26	.38
42.5	.37	.27	.70	.91	.38	.74	.16	.26
37.5	.28	.18	.60	.85	.25	.59	.10	.16
32.5	.18	.11	.48	.77	.15	.41	.06	.09
27.5	.11	.06	.36	.64	.08	.24	.03	.04
22.5	.05	.03	.23	.46	.03	.11	.01	.02
17.5	.02	.01	.12	.28	.01	.04	.004	.006
12.5	.01	.002	.05	.13	.002	.01	.002	.002
7.5	.001	.001	.02	.05	.001	.002	.000	.000
2.5	.000	.000	.005	.01	.000	.001	.000	.000

WALTER CROSBY EELLS,
Stanford University.

Index

January—December, 1930

Accredited Higher Institutions, 1930, pp. 129–147.
American Way, The, C. R. Mann, pp. 276–280
Angell, James Rowland, Yale Institute of Human Relations, pp. 3–11.
Annual Meeting, 1930, pp. 151–153.
Antecedents of the Federal Acts Concerning Education, Edward H. Reisner, pp. 196–207.
Anticipation of Future Needs, Ray Lyman Wilbur, pp. 45–54.
Bibliography of Methods for Personal Development of College Students, Grace E. Manson, Supplement No. 9, Vol. XI, No. 1, pp. 3–42.
Budget, Director's, 1930–31, p. 226.
Bryan, William Lowe, Educational Policies of the United States Government, pp. 55–59.
California Junior College Mental Educational Survey, W. C. Eells, pp. 281–291.
Capen, Samuel P., Relation of the State College to the New Movements in Education, pp. 12–23.
Chairman's Address—A National Program of Educational Research, Charles H. Judd, pp. 164–172.
Director's Budget, 1930–31, p. 226.
Director's Report—Responsibility, C. R. Mann, pp. 173–181.
Education Bills Pending, pp. 38–44.
Education and Health, A Community Problem, Ray Lyman Wilbur, pp. 182–187.
Educational Policies of the United States Government, William Lowe Bryan, pp. 55–59.
Educational Questions, R. M. Hutchins, pp. 252–260.
Educational Research, National Program of, Charles H. Judd, pp. 164–172.
Eells, W. C., California Junior College Mental-Educational Survey, pp. 281–291.
Executive Committee, Report of, pp. 222–225.
Federal Acts Concerning Education, Antecedents of, Edward H. Reisner, pp. 196–207.
Federal Relations to Education, C. R. Mann, pp. 60–100.
Hutchins, R. M., Some Educational Questions, pp. 252–260.
International Intellectual Cooperation, pp. 261–275.
Judd, Charles H., A National Program of Educational Research, pp. 164–172.
Mann, C. R., Federal Relations to Education, pp. 60–100.

Mann, C. R., National Advisory Committee on Education, pp. 24–37.
Mann, C. R., Responsibility—Director's Report, pp. 173–181.
Mann, C. R., The American Way, pp. 276–280.
Manson, Grace E., Bibliography of Methods for Personal Development of College Students, Supplement No. 9, pp. 3–42.
Martino, Nobile Giacomo de, Virgil and the Modern World, pp. 246–251.
Members and Officers, American Council on Education, 1930–31, pp. 234–241.
Mental-Educational Survey in the California Junior Colleges, W. C. Eells, pp. 281–291.
Merriam, John C., Opportunities of the Federal Government in Research, pp. 188–195.
Mussolini, To the Scholars of America, p. 245.
National Advisory Committee on Education, C. R. Mann, pp. 24–37.
National Advisory Committee on Education, Henry Suzzallo, pp. 154–163.
National Program of Educational Research, Chairman's Address, Charles H. Judd, pp. 164–172.
New Movements in Education, Relation of the State and College to, Samuel P. Capen, pp. 12–23.
Officers and Members, American Council on Education, pp. 234–241.
Opportunities of the Federal Government in Research, John C. Merriam, pp. 188–195.
Pending Education Bills, pp. 38–44.
Personal Development of College Students, Bibliography of Methods of, Grace E. Manson, Supplement, pp. 3–42.
Psychological Examination for 1929, L. L. Thurstone, pp. 101–128.
Reisner, Edward H., Antecedents of the Federal Acts Concerning Education, pp. 196–207.
Relation of the State College to the New Movements in Education, Samuel P. Capen, pp. 12–23.
Report of the Executive Committee, pp. 222–225.
Report of the Treasurer, pp. 227–230.
Responsibility, Director's Report, C. R. Mann, pp. 173–181.
Scholars of America, To the, Mussolini, p. 245.
Supplement No. 9, Bibliography of Methods for Personal Development of College Students, Grace E. Manson, Vol. XI, No. 1, pp. 3–42.
Suzzallo, Henry, National Advisory Committee on Education, pp. 154–163.
Thirteenth Annual Meeting, pp. 151–153.
Thorpe, Merle, To the College Graduates of 1930, pp. 208–221.
Thurstone, L. L., The 1929 Psychological Examination, pp. 101–128.
To the College Graduates of 1930, Merle Thorpe, pp. 208–221.
Treasurer's Report, pp. 227–230.
United States Government, Educational Policies of, William Lowe Bryan, pp. 55–59.

Virgil and the Modern World, Nobile Giacomo de Martino, pp. 246–251.
Wilbur, Ray Lyman, Anticipation of Future Needs, pp. 45–54.
Wilbur, Ray Lyman, Education and Health, A Community Problem, pp. 182–187.
Yale Institute of Human Relations, James Rowland Angell, pp. 3–11.